REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 10-14, 16-19 and 22-37 remain pending in the present application. Claims 12-14 and 16-18 have been previously withdrawn. In this reply, independent claims are being amended to further clarify what is being claimed. New claims 38-39 are being added. Claim 37 is canceled. Support for the amendment and new claims can be found on page 6, lines 18-22, page 10, lines 11-21, page 11, line 4 – page 12, line 6, page 12, line 18 – page 13, line 25. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Without conceding to the propriety of the rejection, applicant is canceling claim 37 in this reply.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 4-5, 10, 19, 25, 27-28 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0042022 to Kirkpatrick et al. ("Kirkpatrick"). Kirkpatrick as understood by applicant discloses allowing retail entities to let consumers register a product or warranty at the point of sale. More specifically, a retailer sends a message to an online registration system that consumer wishes to register a purchased product at the point of purchase. The online registration system receives the request from the retailer and presents the registration page to the consumer at the point of purchase. Once the consumer has provided the online registration system with sufficient

information to complete the registration process, the online registration system generates e-mail registration notification to manufacturers and the products are deemed registered.

On the other hand, the claims in the present application allow for automating product registration by transmitting product registration information generated at the time of purchase to a manufacturer for subsequent completion of the registration. Independent claim 1 as amended recites, "storing the product registration information and the customer information at a server associated with the manufacturer; waiting for a user to complete registration; generating at least one web page using said product registration information and said customer information received at the server of said manufacturer at the time the customer purchases said one or more products, wherein said product registration information and said customer information generated at the time of purchase and transmitted to the manufacturer is automatically used for subsequent completion of registration; when a user subsequently logs into a web site associated with the manufacturer, presenting said web page to allow the user to verify and update said product registration information and said customer information; and completing a product registration of said one or more products when the user verifies and updates said product registration information and said customer information." Independent claims 19, 31 and 33 are being similarly amended.

Unlike Kirkpatrick that discloses consumers completing registration at the point of purchase at the retailer site only, the independent claims of the present application recite allowing a user to "subsequently" complete the registration, using the web page generated with the information previously transmitted to the manufacturer at the time of the purchase.

For at least the above reasons, Kirkpatrick does not anticipate claims 1, 19, 31 and 33 and their respective dependent claims by at least virtue of dependency.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 22-24, 27-28, 31 and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kirkpatrick in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0025245 to Flickinger et al. ("Flickinger"). Claims 11, 29-30, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kirkpatrick in view of Flickinger, still in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0034609 to Dovolis ("Dovolis"). Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kirkpatrick in view of Flickinger and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,069,941 to Byrd et al. ("Byrd").

Because Kirkpatrick fails to disclose or suggest the elements of independent claims as discussed above with respect to section 102(e) rejection, and because the rest of the references do not make up for which Kirkpatrick apparently lacks, claims 3, 22-24, 27-28, 31 and 33-36, claims 11, 29-30, and 32, and claim 26 are also believed to be patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons. Further, the cited references do not disclose or suggest, allowing a user to verify and update the information transmitted at the time of purchase, when the user subsequently logs on to complete the registration.

This communication is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and every effort has been made to place the application in condition for allowance. A favorable Office Action is hereby earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might

expedite prosecution of this case, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner call applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman
Registration No.: 34,594

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

SF:EP:me